UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

GREENTREE FINANCIAL GROUP, INC. and WILLIAMS HOLDING CORPORATION,

V.

Case No. 2:16-cv-01988-APG-GWF

Plaintiffs.

ORDER REJECTING PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED PRE-TRIAL ORDER

(ECF No. 20)

PACIFIC STOCK TRANSFER COMPANY,

Defendant.

Plaintiff Greentree Financial Group an individual proposed pre-trial order after defendant Pacific Stock Transfer Company (PST) filed its own pre-trial order. ECF No. 20. I previously rejected PST's proposed order (ECF No. 21) and I reject Greentree's proposed order for the same reason.

Greentree's proposed order does not comply with Local Rules 16-3 in at least two ways. As PST did, Greentree identifies two deposition transcripts, but does not designate the portions of those transcripts it will use, as required by Local Rule 16-3(b)(10). This makes it impossible for PST to properly object as required by Local Rule 16-3(b)(11). If an entire deposition transcript is to be used, that should be stated. This error should be fixed when the joint pre-trial order is submitted.

In addition, Greentree lists nine specific exhibits and then lists "[a]ny document produced by Plaintiff or Defendant in discovery." ECF No. 20 at 7:1. Local Rule 16-3(b)(8) requires parties to list their trial exhibits, rather than reserving their right to rely on "any document" produced in discovery. That vague, broad designation makes it impossible for the other party to object, as required by Local Rule 16-3(b)(8)(B).

IT IS ORDERED that the plaintiff's proposed pretrial order (**ECF No. 20**) is **REJECTED.** The parties shall personally confer as required in Local Rule 16-3, and submit a Joint Pretrial Order that complies with Local Rule 16-4 within 14 days of entry of this Order. If either party fails to participate as required under the Local Rules, the other party should file an individual proposed pre-trial order and explain why it is not a joint proposal.

DATED this 20th day of April, 2018.

ANDREW P. GORDON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE